



webserver@yucca-web.ymmp.gov on 12/02/2007 03:31:55 PM

To: EIS\_Comments@ymmp.gov  
cc:  
Subject: EIS Comment

User Filed as: Not Categorized in ERMS

December 02, 2007 15:31:55

IP address: 71.142.150.165

~~~~~  
The Commentors Name:

---&gt; Mr. John F. Meikle

~~~~~  
The Commentors Address:

---&gt; 1 Hastings Drive

---&gt; Reno, Nevada 89503

~~~~~  
Email Information:

---&gt; jfmeikle@nvgbell.net

---&gt; Add commentor to the mailing list : no

~~~~~  
Contact Information:

---&gt; fax number :

---&gt; phone number :

---&gt; organization :

---&gt; position :

~~~~~  
Comment Text :

---&gt; Dear correspondent at the EIS Office U.S. Department of Energy:

I feel that the only acceptable course of action is to choose "no action" for all three EISs. We should contain nuclear waste as close to its generation site. Moving the waste is very dangerous. Storing the waste at a single national site is an extremely bad idea.

Moving the waste represents a huge threat of a deadly accident and countless terrorist opportunities during transport and during above ground storage prior to burial of the radioactivity. This is the highest possible level nuclear waste, material from 100s of nuclear power plants. Furthermore, after Yucca Mt storage I, there will be a Yucca Mountain II, assuring constant high level radioactive traffic. The rail way is a highly predictable target. The citizens of Nevada and of the entire USA deserve better treatment.

The long term storage site itself is a 100,000 year invitation to terrorists. What could be more inviting as a bomb target than a site that would be lethal to the whole world? Deep burial sounds good, but it would not be deep enough to prevent either a bomb from above or a bomb from the inside. The casks will melt and/or fall apart in less than 500 years. The waste could easily leak into any natural water at the site. And who knows what the climate will be for 100,00 years, particularly with global warming?

The only logical longterm actions are to (1) stop producing high level nuclear

waste, including decommissioning existing nuclear power plants and no more new plants and (2) entombment storage at individual sites.]

Yours truly,

John F. Meikle

---